DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 146 SP 040 227

AUTHOR Lewis, Anne, Ed.
TITLE To Create a Profession: Supporting Teachers as Professionals. A Report of the AASCU Task Force on Professional Development for Teachers.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, New York, NY.; Carnegie Corp. of New York, NY.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Fifth Floor, Washington, DC 20005-4701. Tel: 202-293-7070; Fax: 202-296-5819; Web site: http://www.aascu.org. For full text: http://www.aascu.org/resources/to_teach.pdf.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Beginning Teacher Induction; Beginning Teachers; *College Presidents; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Leadership; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

This report examines the need for ongoing support of teachers as professionals, offering concrete steps that presidents or chancellors can take to improve their programs. It highlights: "A Call for Action"; "What Can University Presidents Do To Best Assure a Competent, Caring and Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom?"; "Why Focus on Professional Development?"; "Why Should Presidents Care about Teacher Education?"; "A Final Word about This Report"; "Some Thoughts about Our Premises"; "Three Premises of Professional Development"; "Three Premises about Universities and Teacher Education"; "Professional Development for Teachers"; "Our Vision"; "Beliefs about Professional Development for Teachers"; "Tools for Constructive Engagement" (leadership in the community, leadership on campus, and systemic analysis); "Induction"; "Graduate Degrees"; "Professional Growth"; "Conclusion" (high quality professional development is essential; university presidents must take an active role, and leadership is critical); and "Summary and Recommendations." (This last section asserts the following: presidents strongly support policies and practices that ensure all teachers are certified to teach the subjects they are assigned; presidents use on-campus and community opportunities to discuss quality teacher education and professional development; they examine the reward structures at their institutions; they conduct an inventory of current practice; and universities conduct an inventory of Master's programs and of professional development activities for P-12 teachers. (Contains 22 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 457 146

Report of the AASCU Task Force

on Professional Development

for Teachers

T G. JAMES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

To Create A Profession

Supporting Teachers As Professionals

aascu

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

SP040327

aascu

To Create a Profession: Supporting Teachers As Professionals

Task Force on Professional Development for Teachers

Sally Clausen (Chair), President, Southeastern Louisiana University

James H. Ammons, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Florida A&M University

Margaret Cozzens, Chief Academic Officer, Colorado Institute of Technology

Anthony J. DiGiorgio, President, Winthrop University, South Carolina

Gary Galluzzo, Executive Vice President, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Virginia

Henry Givens, President, Harris-Stowe State College, Missouri

Roberto Marrero-Corletto, Chancellor, University of Puerto Rico Humacao

Lionel R. (Skip) Meno, Dean, College of Education, San Diego State University, California

Diane L. Reinhard, President, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Kay Schallenkamp, President, Emporia State University, Kansas

Marlene Springer, President, City University of New York, College of Staten Island

AASCU Staff Liaisons

George L. Mehaffy, Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change

Eva Sanderson, Director, Office of Teacher Education

Expressions of Appreciation

The task force would like to express its appreciation to several members of the education community that contributed their time and ideas to this report.

Jeanne Burns, Special Projects Director, Governor's Office, Louisiana

Frances Henry, Member, Louisiana Board of Regents

Stephanie Hirsh, National Staff Development Council, Texas

Gregory O'Brien, Chancellor, University of New Orleans, Louisiana

Dale Scannell, Consultant, National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, Indiana

Harold Suire, President and CEO, Council for a Better Louisiana

A very special thanks to Dale Hair, Program Coordinator, Louisiana Principal Internship Program, who served as the facilitator for the task force. Her contributions were unique and impressive.

The task force would also like to thank the National Commission for Teaching and America's Future and the Carnegie Corporation of New York for their generous support of Anne Lewis, who served as an external editor of this final report.

To My Colleagues in AASCU:

Speaking for the Board of Directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), I am pleased to forward this report of the Task Force on Professional Development for Teachers to our member presidents and chancellors.

The report calls attention to a critical concern, the on-going support of teachers as professionals. AASCU institutions prepare the majority of teachers in this country. Once licensed, however, they need our support to be effective professionals. This Task Force report provides detailed, concrete steps that you can take as a president or chancellor to improve your programs. It also contributes to the public policy dialogue about quality teachers and schools. I commend this report to your thoughtful attention and urge you to read it.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank President Sally Clausen and the members of the Task Force for their diligent work in completing this project and in preparing the final report. I would also like to thank the staff at AASCU and others in the education community who contributed to this project. We are grateful for the contributions of all those who participated in this very meaningful project focused on supporting teachers as professionals.

With kindest regards,

Gladys Styles Johnston

Chancellor, University of Nebraska

at Kearney and AASCU Chair

To Members of the AASCU Community:

Because these extraordinary times call for strong and continuing education for

classroom teachers, this AASCU Report from the AASCU Task Force on Professional Development for Teachers is a timely document. It calls upon AASCU Presidents, who are responsible for training two-thirds of America's teachers, to take the lead in improving the quantity and quality of America's teaching force. Partnerships with area schools must be strengthened and high quality, research-based professional development provided. Further, AASCU presidents must ensure that professional development is tied directly to teaching and school reform initiatives.

In the 20th century, many university and college based programs of teacher preparation and support did an excellent job of preparing America's children for the challenges of their time. Our success as a nation, from advances in science and technology to improvements in the human condition, testify to our previous successes. Now, however, in a new century with new challenges, teacher preparation needs to be strengthened again. At a time of an emerging shortage of teachers, universities face the challenge of revising the way teachers are prepared (what they need to know and be able to do). Many of our classrooms are presently filled with teachers who were adequately prepared at an earlier time but now need agility with modern technology and support from high quality professional development to stay current, confident and competent. Many others teach in fields for which they have not been trained. They are struggling to attend college classes to meet certification requirements, and learn new ways to address the immediate needs in their classrooms, while fulfilling the demanding requirements of full-time teaching.

In addition to improving teacher preparation and support, AASCU's colleges and universities can also contribute to solving a growing problem: an emerging teacher shortage of great significance. The shortage is already severe in areas of math, science and special education, among ethnic minorities and in certain geographic locations. Four major factors have contributed to this problem: Two-thirds of America's teachers are eligible for retirement this decade; too few young people are entering the teaching profession; compensation is grossly inadequate in certain teaching fields of study; and more than a third of those who enter teaching leave within five years (in great part because of limited professional growth opportunities and poor working conditions). High quality teacher preparation and high quality professional development can do more than improve teaching and learning. High quality programs can simultaneously address the teacher shortage by increasing the number of candidates entering the field and by retaining more of those candidates through supportive professional development programs.

For over a year an AASCU Task Force on Professional Development for Teachers has endeavored to address these issues and to provide professional recommendations to presidents and chancellors. Its final report is offered here and I commend it to you.

As we set forth this call for action to provide high quality professional development for teachers, AASCU joins President George W. Bush and the United States Secretary of Education, Roderick Paige, in their call that every child deserves a qualified and certified teacher. AASCU institutions can help transform that compelling call into a confident future.

With kindest regards,

Constantine W. Curris

In the past 10 years teacher quality has been identified as the most important element in P-12 school improvement. Research tells us that it is the largest single variable in student learning-responsible for nearly 40 percent of the difference-irrespective of student preparation, ethnicity, or socio-economic status. That insight holds enormous implications for everyone involved in the preparation of the teaching profession. The states, for example, are establishing sophisticated career ladders, increased pay, and greater recognition for teachers and their work. The building blocks of a true profession are being put into place.

A looming teacher shortage, however, threatens to erode recent gains and to wipe out progress towards building a profession of teaching. Yet the two issues, quality and shortage, are inter-related. In their first five years of teaching, 30 percent of new teachers will leave the profession, and those most quickly prepared and least well supported will leave in even larger numbers. Increasing the number of well-prepared and appropriately supported teachers will reduce attrition and increase teacher quality simultaneously. This report focuses on one dimension of the problem-the professional development of teachers once they receive an initial license to teach-and the strategies that a university president can use to assure that his or her institution provides high-quality programs of professional development.

This is a unique time in American history. A number of organizations and influential voices are now joining together to craft a powerful vision of teachers as professionals. In this new climate of consensus, AASCU college and university presidents have a rare opportunity to take a strong visible leadership role in addressing the issue of quality support for teachers, both in their own institutions and in the larger public. It is an opportunity that must not be lost.

What Can University Presidents Do to Best Assure a Competent, Caring and Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom?

A number of national reports, including a recent one from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), have exhorted university presidents, along with others, to make teacher education a priority on their campuses. Those reports were enormously valuable in calling attention to the importance of the preparation of teachers. Now we must move to a new level of commitment. AASCU university presidents care deeply about both teacher education and the quality of the public P-12 schools in this country. However, exhortation can go only so far. The goal of this task force report is to provide presidents with very specific tools to engage both their own campuses and the larger community in meaningful reform, through analysis and action on their campuses and through advocacy of innovative policies and practices in the larger community.

Why Focus on Professional Development?

This report builds upon the March 1999 report of the AASCU Task Force on Teacher Education. However, it does not address all of teacher education as did the earlier report. Initial teacher preparation already has received a great deal of attention through national reports from associations, a national report card mandated by the federal government, strengthened state policies and regulations, and reform initiatives on campuses. The critical issues today in the area of initial licensure are making certain that an adequate number of well prepared candidates graduate and that states are not using short cuts, which often violate their own standards, to meet increasing shortages.

The real challenge for universities is professional development-everything professionally that happens to a classroom teacher once she or he is initially licensed. Granted, professional development is not the sole responsibility of universities. Schools and other agencies also have significant responsibilities for staff development, and they deliver many high quality programs. However, universities play a unique role in providing the high quality, sustained professional development that will result in greater student achievement. They link research and practice. They also link pedagogy and ever deepening content knowledge needed by teachers. No other institution offers these elements for professional growth.

Unfortunately, universities are quickly becoming irrelevant in professional development for teachers as school districts, regional centers, professional associations and private providers take an ever-increasing responsibility for professional development. In the future, universities may lose any role in professional development, and while that would be a great loss for them, it would be a much greater loss for the public schools and for teachers. We believe universities have much to offer in the professional development of teachers, but only when they provide high quality programs that are responsive to the needs of the profession. University presidents have a critical role to play in ensuring that their institutions remain vital to the teaching profession.

Why Should Presidents Care About Teacher Education?

AASCU has an historic commitment to public education, especially the preparation of teachers. Many AASCU institutions began as normal schools and take pride in their sustained contributions to public education. Equally important, more than 60 percent of all future public school teachers in the United States are prepared in AASCU institutions. Our institutions have been and are at the center of teacher preparation in this country.

Moreover, universities and P-12 schools are locked in a cycle of mutual interdependence. The university's outputs (teachers) are inputs to the P-12 system, and the P-12 outputs (students) are inputs to the university system. Each partner in this relationship gains enormously by improving the quality of its own graduates.

The recent Title II reporting requirements illustrate the special position of teacher education in the American consciousness. The federal government, for example, does not require that test scores of prospective accountants, nurses, or lawyers be publicly reported. Yet this year, all universities will report the test scores of prospective teachers, and institutions will be publicly ranked as a result of them. This has happened because public education is still valued, as it has been since our country began, as essential to prosperity for individuals, the health of the economy, and the exercise of democratic principles. Thus, teacher preparation is a central mission of American higher education. More than any other program on

campus, its work connects to external policymaking. The curriculum, admission and exit standards, and other program requirements of teacher education are affected by (indeed shaped by) state licensure rules, federal regulations, and external accreditation.

This special role for teacher education, on campus and in society, impels hands-on presidential leadership to make sure the program meets the demands being made of it. In large, complex organizations, it is often difficult to change systemic processes and ways of thinking without strong visible leadership. The preparation and sustained support for teachers are undergoing a necessary transformation, and universities must change to meet the new challenges. Presidents, of course, rely on provosts, deans, and faculty to develop high quality programs, but it is the voices of presidents that best advocate, clearly and compellingly, for quality teacher education, whether within the campus or to a wider public. Teacher education is now a high-stakes undertaking for the whole university community, and presidents must be seen as leaders in addressing the increasing expectations that universities produce high quality teachers for America's schools.

A Final Word About This Report

This task force report is deliberately brief. A page has been created on the AASCU web site to catalogue and store supporting information and provide access to detailed resources. This new webpage will be maintained by the AASCU national office in Washington, D.C. (www.aascu.org/teacher_education/). The newly created Office of Teacher Education at AASCU will also provide additional support for AASCU campuses engaged in systemic teacher education reform efforts. It will build and sustain critical linkages and partnerships with colleague organizations and associations also committed to and engaged in teacher education reform.

This report and the webpage that supports it are intended to encourage AASCU universities to work both individually and collaboratively, especially with partner school districts, to create and sustain high quality professional development experiences. The challenge is all encompassing, from induction and master's degree programs to the entire range of ongoing professional development activities that teachers need to sustain their commitment to quality.

Some Thoughts About Our Premises

The task force report is based on certain conceptions about both professional development and the university role in teacher education.

We believe that a quality education for all children is the most effective means of preserving our democracy, ensuring a strong economy, and providing quality lives for our citizens. What Thomas Jefferson declared in the early years of our republic is just as true today: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be." While a high level of education is an economic imperative for these times, it remains essential to the ability of all citizens to have full meaning and purpose in their lives.

We also believe that the critical factor in education is the quality of the teacher. Every child in America deserves the best education possible, and that means having an effective teacher. This proposition was first enunciated by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future in its 1996 report, What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future. We strongly endorse it. No child in this country should be limited by an impoverished education that occurs because of an inadequate teacher. The AASCU Task Force embraces the bold, audacious goal, first expressed by the National Commission: every child in America deserves a

competent, caring and qualified teacher.

Three Premises of Professional Development

Premise One-A teacher is the most important single factor in student learning. The growth of widespread mandatory testing in the public schools over the last two decades provides a broad database with which to measure the effects of teacher quality on student performance. The results of these studies are clear and convincing: the quality of the teacher is the single most important factor accounting for the variability in student performance, even when students' prior education, socioeconomic background, and other factors are included.

Premise Two-Teacher effectiveness is increasingly measured by what students learn. The emerging expectation is that teachers will be evaluated by their capacity to promote student learning, regardless of students' background and preparation. Cumulative research on the "value added" by teachers to students' knowledge and skills has encouraged some school districts and states to begin a rigorous assessment of teacher effectiveness tied to student learning outcomes.

Premise Three-Teacher quality is affected by both content knowledge and knowledge of how to teach. There is a great deal of interest in improving the subject matter knowledge of teachers, and we strongly support that concern. However, we also acknowledge research that indicates the critical importance of high-quality preparation in how to teach. Indeed, it is at the intersection of both content knowledge and teaching skills where we must focus much of our efforts and where fruitful new programs can be created.

Three Premises About Universities and Teacher Education

Premise One-The improvement of teacher quality is a systemic issue, involving the interaction of public policy and many groups and agencies. Improving teacher quality requires improvements throughout the system: in the universities that prepare and provide professional development for teachers, in the public schools that place and sustain teachers, and in the governmental agencies that regulate them.

Premise Two-The president and provost must be strong and visible leaders for teacher education. If teacher education is an all-university responsibility, then the president must exercise leadership to engage everyone in that task. It is the president who makes the campus take notice of the imperative to support a quality teaching force. The provost plays an equally important role. It is the provost who sets certain actions in motion intended to challenge previous traditions and practices such as identifying resources and changing policies and reward systems. Many others on campus must be involved in improving teacher education, but the critical leadership must come from the president and provost.

Premise Three-Within universities, teacher education is an all-university responsibility. The initial preparation and on-going development of quality teachers for the public schools requires the commitment of the entire university campus. Teachers acquire subject-matter knowledge, after all, in many different departments and programs on campus. Additionally, teachers learn not only content but also how to teach that content by the way they are taught. The responsibility for the preparation of quality teachers, whether for initial licensure or for on-going professional development, belongs to the whole university.

Professional Development for Teachers

For too many teachers, professional development often is a series of disjointed, unconnected activities that make little difference in the development of teaching skills and ultimately in the learning outcomes for students. Numerous studies have revealed the problems of many traditional approaches to professional development. In 1997, for example, the Education Commission of the States (ECS), commenting on a study of 16 school districts, noted that "much of what passes for professional development is only marginally related to what is known about improved student learning." Others have criticized the "make and take" nature of much that passes for professional development.

This nation no longer can afford inadequate professional support for teachers. Much of the current teacher shortage is created by the high rates of attrition of young teachers within the first few years of teaching. Predictions of a need for two million new teachers in the next 10 years are fueled, in part, by attrition predictions. Studies conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and others have found that 26 percent of new teachers leave the profession within the first three years, and 30 percent leave within the first five years. While some attrition occurs in any profession, professional development through quality induction programs can help many new teachers adjust to the profession, improve their performance in the classroom, and remain committed to the teaching profession.

Second, as the information age takes over, knowledge of subject matter content, how students learn, and how to teach are changing rapidly. The older models of teaching licensure, with a lifetime credential or programs that required only limited professional development, are being replaced by licensure requirements that mandate continuous professional development. High-performance schools demand teaching professionals who remain current in their discipline(s) and in emerging understanding of teaching and learning.

Though beyond the scope of this report, we also acknowledge the critical leadership role of principals and teacher-leaders in high performing schools. Increasingly, these professionals play a critical role in the creation of high quality, relevant university professional development programs. Some of the most promising practices involve creating professional development schools that span the traditional boundaries between universities and P-12 schools.

We acknowledge that the distinctions we draw between pre-service preparation and professional development often are blurred. The increasing demand for new teachers leads to a growing practice of hiring individuals who have not completed their initial preparation program. This seems to occur most frequently along the three coasts of the United States, where demand for new teachers is overwhelming. Also, many districts hire non-licensed teachers for whom professional development must be both pre-service and continuing education. Nevertheless, we believe that the distinction is useful, especially to call attention to the continuing and on-going renewal of the teaching profession. In a previous era, many perceived that obtaining a master's degree was the final step necessary for one to achieve the lifetime status of a teaching professional. We argue that teachers, like all other professionals, now have to engage in a continuous process of self-reflection and renewal. The research literature and current policymaking endorse this view. John Goodlad, a major researcher on teacher quality, sums up the findings in his call for all institutions and organizations that prepare, license, and hire teachers to make a commitment "to support and sustain lifelong teaching

careers characterized by professional growth, service, and satisfaction."

Our Vision

The presidents of AASCU institutions will take a highly visible, active leadership role in creating long-term, sustained, collaborative partnerships between P-12, business, and the total university to bring about systemic, standards-based, high-quality professional development programs for educators that result in improved student achievement.

We believe, like Goodlad, that all of the institutions involved in the preparation and employment of teachers share a joint responsibility for their continued success. At times, the role of one or another of these institutions may be more prominent, but we assert that it is always a joint responsibility. Initial preparation, we believe, is the primary role of colleges and universities, but with significant participation from the public schools. Induction, by contrast, is the principal responsibility of the employing school districts, but universities must be involved there as well. Professional development takes many forms, and universities and public schools must take varying roles and responsibilities, depending on the nature of the program. Most importantly, we believe that without the critical participation of both universities and the public schools, professional development will never be as rich as it ought to be.

Why must universities continue to be involved in the professional development of teachers? First, subject matter expertise resides in universities. The discovery and codification of new knowledge and the reinterpretation of established knowledge are core functions of the university in the United States. It is in universities that discipline knowledge resides. Second, universities conduct, develop, challenge, and publicize research in this country. Great strides could be made if this tremendous capacity for research could be harnessed in the service of teacher education and the public schools. Third, university faculty have enormous talents in education and other disciplines that could be used effectively to provide high quality, sustained professional development for teachers. Having said that, however, let us also acknowledge our own failings. While universities hold enormous promise, far too often today their professional development programs do not meet high-quality standards and have not addressed teachers and their classroom issues appropriately. Indeed, many universities do not see themselves as responsible for professional development for teachers, in part because policy makers under-fund this role for universities.

Beliefs About Professional Development For Teachers

It results in greater success for every student.

It is critical for all those who affect student learning.

It is fundamental to school improvement.

It is on-going and unending. Like any other professional, teachers must continuously seek to renew and update their knowledge and skills. Public policy must support and fund that concept. Yet, in many states public policy encourages teachers to complete their professional training with a master's degree or other terminal event, and many states do not adequately fund professional development.

All educators share the responsibility for both individual and organizational growth.

Effective professional development is based upon theory, research, and proven practice.

Higher education should foster collaborative professional development partnerships with P-12 schools.

Effective professional development takes many forms including, but not limited to: induction, advanced degrees, certificates and credentials, and campus and district in-service programs. In each of these, the highest standards are essential. Therefore, we endorse the National Staff Development Council concepts of what constitutes best practices for professional development. They will be:

Results Driven (focused on learning achievement for students).

Standards-Based (derived from standards about quality professional development that in turn are developed from the standards of learning expected of P-12 students);

Job-Embedded (connected to and built into the daily work of teachers); and

Content-Rich (developing deeper understanding of discipline content knowledge).

Recommendations: Tools for Constructive Engagement

We do not intend for these recommendations to be taken as a universal set of ideas. We know there are vast differences among AASCU institutions in size, mission, and experience. We also recognize that many AASCU institutions are engaged in innovative and imaginative programs and practices, as we acknowledge in the supporting web site's section on innovative practices where many AASCU institutions are represented. We urge AASCU presidents to consider this array of recommendations and choose those most useful to them in their own special context. We hope the recommendations provide new opportunities to continue the work that many of you already have begun by helping you focus on some specific aspect or dimension of professional development that may not have received adequate attention in the past.

Leadership in the Community-Policy Advocacy

We recommend that AASCU presidents:

• Advocate for high quality professional development for teachers as a means of improving professionalism and sustaining achievement. It also is important to support state and district policies that promote and fund continuous learning and renewal for all teachers.

• Strongly support policies and practices that assure all teachers are certified to teach the subjects they are assigned.

• Support local professional development schools and other forms of university/P-12 school collaboration that result in improved professional development programs.

• Endorse statewide P-16 councils and other strategies that increase communication between the P-12 and higher education communities in each state.

• Advocate for expanded research on student learning and teacher effectiveness.

• Support the development of a state inventory of effective teacher education policies to encourage comparison to current practice.

• Create president-superintendent linkages, when appropriate, and other administrator-to-administrator linkages between the campus and the public school districts the campus serves to foster a dialogue on programs needed for effective professional development.

Leadership on Campus

We recommend that AASCU presidents

• Talk about teacher education and especially professional development on campus, in the community, and in written communications.

• Provide tangible evidence of their commitment to teacher education programs through recognition of programs, faculty, and/or students.

• Take concrete actions on their own campuses, in policy and in practice, to demonstrate an all-university commitment to teacher education.

• Visit public schools and talk to teachers, especially graduates of their programs, to provide visible evidence of leadership and commitment and to receive feedback.

Systemic Analysis

We recommend that AASCU presidents:

u Commission an examination of the reward structures (promotion, tenure, funding, reassigned time, recognition, etc.) at their colleges or universities.

• Does the institution have mechanisms to acknowledge the extensive work necessary for effective collaboration between university faculty and public school faculty and administrators?

• Does the institution provide ways to encourage/reward faculty to work in the public schools?

• Does the institution encourage/reward faculty outside education to provide appropriate staff development for teachers?

• Does the institutional promotion and tenure system recognize and reward action research in public school settings?

• Commission an examination of the funding level of the field experience/ clinical teacher education program on campus relative to other clinical programs, such as nursing. Does support for teacher education include an adequate level of funding to support and sustain high quality, supervised field and clinical experiences?

Induction

Beginning teachers need expert, continuous support-for the sake of their students and of their own professional careers.

Induction programs are now mandated or funded by 28 states. Between 1994 and 1997, 46 percent of new teachers participated in an induction program in their first year on the job. High-quality induction programs can cut the attrition rate for beginning teachers in half. The National Center for Education Statistics found that for new teachers who had participated in an induction program, the attrition rate was only 15 percent in the first three years as compared to 26 percent for teachers who began without this kind of support. Furthermore, quality induction programs often have the greatest impact on keeping new teachers with the most promise.

However, there is considerable difference among the programs. Some are very high quality, others much less so. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, there are several key questions to address as states, districts, and schools design and implement quality induction programs. These are questions that a president might ask the education dean to report on, based on research and current local practice:

• How should mentors be selected? What qualifications do they need to have?

• Should mentors continue to teach or should they be released from teaching to mentor?

• How many new teachers should a mentor serve a year? How long should mentoring last?

• Should mentoring involve assessment and evaluation? Should evaluating and mentoring be handled by the same individual?

• Should mentors receive professional development training to learn to mentor?

• How should the programs be funded? What is the potential for sharing resources between the state, school districts, and universities?

Recommendations

We recommend that:

• Every teacher education graduate of an AASCU institution be placed in a high-quality induction program to assure the teacher continues to develop a robust repertoire of teaching skills and abilities.

• Universities work collaboratively with the public schools where their graduates are placed to ensure that the induction experience is a high-quality, well-designed program. We further urge that universities and public schools work together to create programs that meet emerging national expectations.

• An inventory of current practice be conducted. The inventory might include, but not be limited to:

• How many students graduate with teaching credentials from your institution each year?

• What is the placement success of your students, and in what districts are they hired?

• What is the success rate of your teachers, measured by their students' achievement, principals' reports, etc.?

• What is the attrition rate of your students after five years?

u AASCU institutions consider implementing a guarantee or warranty program for teacher education graduates. A warranty program creates another opportunity for collaboration between universities and public schools, creates the potential for a feedback mechanism on program strengths and weaknesses, and allows universities to negotiate conditions of placement with employing school districts, stipulating, for example, that new teachers will be adequately supported and only assigned to teach subject areas for which they are prepared.

Graduate Degrees

AASCU presidents need to examine deeply the graduate degrees, especially the master's programs, and ask: How can the master's degree become a strategy for providing high quality professional development for teachers? How does an AASCU institution articulate both systemic and individual professional development? What is the institution's vision of an accomplished teacher and how does the master's degree advance teachers toward that goal?

Many schools of education concentrate on undergraduate and doctoral programs to the detriment of the master's degree. Furthermore, some master's degree programs have the effect of removing large numbers of talented individuals from the classroom by preparing them for careers as principals, counselors, or other non-teaching roles.

In addition, there is a fundamental structural problem with most master's degrees for teachers. In general, education degrees place insufficient emphasis on content, and subject matter discipline degrees place insufficient emphasis on pedagogy. For elementary teachers, the problem is exacerbated by the lack of adequate undergraduate preparation in a specific subject matter discipline required for entry into a graduate program. Many master's degrees in specific subject areas are also problematic for teachers because they become too narrowly focused too quickly. Teachers often need both the broad view of the discipline and an in-depth concentration. There is an enormous need for greater collaboration between teacher education and the rest of the academic disciplines in the conceptualization of a new, innovative master's degree for teachers that could combine content knowledge with how to teach that content.

The master's degree for teachers should be a tool for developing superior teaching abilities that will result in higher student achievement. Yet many traditional master's programs, even those designed for teachers, are not structured around student learning outcomes. These programs often do not effectively address issues of state learning standards and the curriculum of the public schools. Many traditional master's programs schedule courses in late afternoon and evening, at the end of a long work day for teachers. In addition, courses are often scheduled only on campus, without any real rationale for that location. Individual courses are often disconnected from each other, lacking a unifying theme or set of goals. Courses often are not focused on real classroom problems.

These traditional master's programs often rely on didactic instruction that does not involve experienced teachers as active learners. Often there is little effective use of technology that might allow teachers to remain in their schools and work together as teams on problems of student learning. Too often, instruction in these programs is teacher-centered rather than student-centered, without enough interactive teaching and active learning. Programs often provide no real opportunity for sustained, collaborative focus on the improvement of participants'

classroom teaching and learning. Furthermore, some faculty who teach in master's programs are not well connected to the schools and to recent school issues. Finally, many master's degree programs fail to build cooperation with public school offices and resources, and neglect to create a sustained dialogue between key entities about program design, best practices, resources, research, etc.

We strongly endorse efforts underway at a number of AASCU institutions to redesign the master's degree for teachers in ways that address the problems discussed above. Several institutions are now developing innovative master's degrees that prepare teachers for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification. As yet, there is no one best way to align master's degrees in education with NBPTS standards nor are there many comprehensive models from which to learn what works best. We applaud the experimentation underway and hope that through such efforts, new effective models may emerge. Several other institutions are developing new master's degrees that combine a focus on content and on pedagogy, in the process integrating faculty from arts and sciences and from education. Finally, some institutions are using new designs and new delivery systems, particularly emphasizing the use of technology, to provide greater flexibility in course hours and locations. These new designs allow teachers to work together, often in their own school settings, focusing on the improvement of their classrooms and their students' learning.

Recommendations

We recommend that AASCU presidents

• Commission an inventory of master's programs at their institutions. Among the questions to be asked:

• What percentage of students receiving master's degrees in education at your institution are receiving degrees to leave the classroom (to become administrators, counselors, etc.)? What percentage are receiving degrees to improve their teaching?

• How many currently employed teachers receive graduate degrees annually from your institution (broken down by degree types, i.e. degrees in education, liberal arts and sciences, etc.)?

• How could technology be used to provide high quality master's degrees, focusing on classroom environments and on student learning?

u Initiate development of new master's degrees for professional development for teachers. These degrees might:

• focus, first and foremost, on improving the achievement of students that teachers teach.

• be rigorous, academic, and student-centered.

• provide increased knowledge of content and how to teach that content.

• focus on the real dilemmas of classroom teachers: on their contexts, circumstances, and concerns.

• have a collaborative focus, encouraging the active participation of education faculty, other faculty on the university campus, and personnel from the public

schools.

• involve partnerships among key stakeholders such as school superintendents, teachers unions, college administrators, and college and P-12 faculty, and the sharing of resources.

• employ collaborative and team learning approaches.

• schedule courses at times and places to ensure the greatest and most effective participation of working teachers.

• use technology extensively to deliver course material in innovative ways, to redesign the courses to maximize participation of working adults, and to prepare teachers for the proficient use of technology with their own students.

• Initiate a study of additional certificates and non-degree programs that may be responsive to local area needs.

• Delegate a study of the appropriateness of creating a master's degree that prepares individuals for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.

• Examine the possibility of creating a set of courses or modules applicable for both completion of a master's degree and for other professional development programs such as certificate programs.

Professional Growth

Professional development for teachers is now estimated to be a $ 25 billion enterprise, which has prompted a great deal of interest from new private providers such as Sylvan Learning. Universities must provide high quality programs and be much more entrepreneurial to compete effectively in the new marketplace.

A number of groups now advocate models of staff development that meet new criteria or guidelines. One of the most prominent new conceptions comes from the newly developed standards published by the National Staff Development Council. We endorse its principles of effective staff development. We also endorse the National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching's research-based principles for improving professional development. Finally, we acknowledge that a substantial amount of innovation in university-public school collaboration is emerging from the growth and development of professional development schools (PDS). While many such schools now focus on initial preparation for teachers, that same environment could foster the development of innovative, collaborative programs of on-going professional development.

At the same time, we also recognize that an effort to support professional development for public school teachers may create questions on a campus about the professional development provided to university faculty. Clearly, university faculty have some financial resources for professional travel and are provided with time to engage in their own professional growth. However, the criticism of lack of support may be legitimate. One way to answer that criticism may be to create a teacher enhancement center on campus to support both university and public school faculty with a combination of programs in the center (for public school faculty able to participate there) and a robust outreach program. The use of technology makes outreach more available and useful than ever before.

Recommendations

We recommend that AASCU presidents

• Commission an inventory of professional development activities provided for P-12 teachers on your campus. Among the questions to be asked:

• What is the nature and scope of activities provided by the university that would be defined as professional development for teachers that is linked to student achievement?

• What professional development needs exist in the school districts served that could be provided by the university alone or by the university in partnership with others?

• How could the university use technology to facilitate high quality professional development, focused on teachers' classrooms and student learning?

• Compare their inventory of professional development activities to the emerging standards of best practice and make appropriate adjustments when current activities do not seem congruent with national standards.

• Develop collaborative structures with the public schools, such as professional development schools, to create a context and environment in which innovative programs can develop. Another possible collaborative structure could be teacher enhancement centers to provide on-going support for university and public school teachers. We urge the use of innovative funding mechanisms, including joint university/public school support, and the innovative use of personnel with new roles and responsibilities.

• Advocate for policies and regulations that promote continual professional development for public school teachers.

Conclusion

The importance of teacher quality is now a compelling policy issue across the country, fueled by our growing understanding of the critical role that good teachers play in student learning and the equally deleterious effects of a bad teacher. As a result, teacher pay is increasing, sometimes because of National Board certification, and sometimes because of demonstrated student achievement, particularly in places like California. Teacher salaries are also rising as a result of teacher shortages, which are exacerbated by the focus on quality. Teachers are being offered a broad range of incentives to teach in specific districts and schools. This increase in salaries is being accompanied by some tentative focus on working conditions, especially factors that encourage early leaving such as isolation and lack of opportunity for professional judgment. Rising respect, increasing salaries, and new attention to working conditions signal a new and important effort to make teaching a true profession.

A critical element in professionalizing teaching will be the creation of high quality professional development. To respond to this need, however, universities must make difficult choices. Once upon a time, universities had a near monopoly on providing continuing education to teachers, especially at the master's degree level. But the landscape of professional development for teachers is changing rapidly, and universities are no longer the principal providers. The forces that shaped university programs for the past century are rapidly disappearing. Programs, ways of delivering, and instructional strategies that were successful in

the past will no longer serve us well in the future. The historic separation of higher education from P-12 schooling is being substantially challenged by new P-16 councils, which are developing exciting ways of working together. The practice of preparing teachers and then abandoning them is being replaced by collaborative induction programs that nurture and sustain new professionals. Older conceptions of scholarship and traditional master's degrees may no longer be appropriate as we move into a new century. Finally, new providers and new programs are rapidly challenging what many universities may have regarded as their exclusive responsibility, and in the process they are changing the entire face of professional development for teachers.

If universities are to meet these new challenges and opportunities, presidents must take an active, visible role. Leadership will be critical. Many of the challenges of changing university policy and practice extend far beyond the ability of talented faculty, creative department chairs, or even committed deans. Some of the policy and practice issues are rooted in ways of thinking and doing that have become, over time, deeply ingrained in the institution. Without strong, imaginative, and creative leadership by the president, it will be very hard for institutions to change. Yet if they do not, the institution may lose any role in the on-going professional development of teachers. That would be a significant loss for the university and an irreparable loss for the public schools and the nation. No work undertaken on a campus may be as difficult as changing policy and practice about teacher education, yet none has more importance for young students, their families and our society.

Summary of Recommendations

Leadership in the Community

• Presidents advocate for high-quality professional development for teachers as a means of improving professionalism and sustaining achievement, including state and district policies that support such professional development.

• Presidents strongly support policies and practices that assure all teachers are certified to teach the subjects they are assigned.

• Presidents support local professional development schools and other forms of university/P-12 collaboration that result in improved professional development programs.

• Presidents support statewide P-16 councils and other strategies that increase communication between the P-12 and higher education communities.

• Presidents support expanded research on student learning and teacher effectiveness.

• Presidents support the development of a state inventory of teacher education policies and practices.

• President-superintendent linkages be developed, when appropriate, and other such collaboration be supported.

Leadership on Campus

• Presidents use opportunities on campus and in the community to discuss quality

teacher education and professional development.

• Presidents provide tangible evidence of their commitment to teacher education programs through recognition of programs, faculty or students.

• Presidents take concrete actions on their own campuses, in policy and in practice, to demonstrate an all-university commitment to teacher education.

• Presidents visit public schools to meet with graduates of their programs and obtain feedback.

Systemic Analysis

• Presidents examine the reward structures (promotion, tenure, funding, reassigned time, recognition) at their colleges or universities.

• Presidents examine the funding level of the field experience/clinical teacher education program on campus relative to other clinical programs.

Induction Support

• Presidents conduct an inventory of current practice.

• Every teacher education graduate is placed in a high-quality induction program.

• Universities work with the public schools where their graduates are placed to ensure the induction experience meets high standards.

• Universities consider implementing a guarantee or warranty program for teacher education graduates, primarily to serve as feedback on the quality of their preparation programs.

Master's degree

• Universities conduct an inventory of master's programs.

• Universities develop master's degrees for professional development that advance deep understanding of content knowledge and of how to teach.

• Universities create a set of design principles for master's degree that are responsive to teachers' needs and to desired student learning outcomes.

• Universities investigate the possibilities of a master's degree that prepares individuals for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification.

• Universities develop a master's degree with content applicable to both completion of a degree and to other professional development programs.

Professional Growth

• Universities conduct an inventory of professional development activities provided for P-12 teachers.

• Universities compare their inventory to the emerging standards of best practice.

• Universities develop collaborative structures within schools to create a context and environment in which innovative programs can develop.

• Presidents advocate for policies and regulations that promote continual professional development for public school teachers.

References and Bibliography

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1999). Call for teacher education reform. A Report of the AASCU Task Force on Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: AASCU.

American Council on Education (1999). To touch the Future: Transforming the Way Teachers are Taught: An Action Agenda for College and University Presidents. Washington, D.C.: ACE.

Education Commission of the States (2000). In pursuit of quality teaching: Five key strategies for policymakers. Denver, Colorado: ECS.

Blackwell, P. J., & Diez, M. (1999). Achieving the new vision of master's education for teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Breidenstein, A. (2000). Reforming teacher education: The promise of extended programs. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 36, 111-115.

Council of Great City Colleges of Education, Council of Great City Schools, & Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (2000). The urban teacher challenge: Teacher supply and demand in the great city schools. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards. New York, New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Education Week (2000). Quality Counts 2000: Who should teach? Editorial Project in Education, XIX. Washington, D.C.: Education Week.

Galluzzo, G. (1999). Aligning standards to improve teacher preparation and practice. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Goodlad, J. I. (2000). Postulate Twenty. Seattle, Washington: Institute For Educational Inquiry.

Grissmer, D. W., & Kirby, S. N. (1987). Teacher attrition: The uphill climb to staff the nation's schools. Santa Monica, California.: RAND Corporation.

Hawley, W. D. (2000). Quality Induction is Crucial. State Education Leader, 18 (2), 10-11.

Lewis, A. (1999). Toward Learner-Centered Professional Development: A Guide to Research Based Policy and Practice. Washington, D.C.: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching.

National Alliance for Business (2001). Investing in Teaching. Washington, D.C.: National Alliance for Business.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1999). What teachers should know and be able to do. Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation.

National Center for Education Statistics (2000). Progress through the teacher pipeline: 1992-93 college graduates and elementary/secondary school teaching as of 1997. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission for Teaching and America's Future (1996). What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

National Commission for Teaching and America's Future (2000). District Induction Programs That Work. Urban Initiative Partners Newsletter, 2.

National Staff Development Council (2001). NSDC Standards for Staff Development. Oxford, Ohio: NSDC.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). A New Vision for Staff Development. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tom, A. R. (1999). Reinventing master's degree study for experienced teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 50(4), 245-254.